

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JACQUELINE MINION,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 12-12128

v.

Hon. John Corbett O'Meara

EXEL, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

/

**ORDER DENYING
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Before the court is Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration regarding the court's July 31, 2014 order granting costs in favor of Defendant Exel, Inc. Defendant filed a response on August 28, 2014. The standard for granting a motion for reconsideration is as follows:

Generally, and without restricting the court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration which merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant shall not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

LR 7.1(h)(3). A motion for reconsideration "is not properly used as a vehicle to re-

hash old arguments or to advance positions that could have been argued earlier but were not.” Smith v. Mount Pleasant Schools, 298 F. Supp.2d 636, 637 (E.D. Mich. 2003) (citing Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians v. Engler, 146 F.3d 357, 374 (6th Cir. 1998)).

By reiterating arguments considered by the court and by raising arguments for the first time in her motion for reconsideration, Plaintiff has failed to show a “palpable defect” by which the court and parties have been misled.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

s/John Corbett O’Meara
United States District Judge

Date: September 8, 2014

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties of record on this date, September 8, 2014, using the ECF system and/or ordinary mail.

s/William Barkholz
Case Manager